Application No: 10/828,956

Response to Office Action Mailed November 10, 2010

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 are pending. This paper is part of a response to a Office Action mailed November 10,

2010. Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph. Claims 1-19 stand rejected

on the ground of non-statutory double patenting due to the previously presented terminal disclaimer

not be accepted.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph:

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph. The claims have been rejected for

calling out elements such as "means for locating" "Means for modifying" and so on that are means

plus function limitations that invoke 35 USC 112 6th paragraph, which the Examiner does not find

disclosed in the written description. The Examiner has required that either the claims or the

specification be amended to expressly recite the structure(s) disclosed in the written description.

The Applicant disagrees with this Claim Rejection. The Applicant asserts that the principle of

prosecution estoppel needs to be applied fairly and equally both for patent representatives, and for

Patent Examiners. As the amendment to the specification clarifies, this patent application is

descended from two parent applications which have issued as patents 6,792,535 and 6,434,701, both

of which include claims referring to the specific means plus function elements that the Examiner has

rejected. The parent patent were properly examined and consequently, there are not one, but two

separate times when similar claims have been deemed fit by the standards of 25 USC 112 2^{nd} and 6^{th}

paragraphs. These Claims are allowable and the Examiner is requested to remove this rejection from

these Claims.

Claim Rejections on the Grounds of Non-statutory Doubling Patenting:

Claims 1-19 stand rejected on the ground of non-statutory double patenting due to the previously

presented terminal disclaimer not be accepted. A new terminal disclaimer accompanies this paper

that is signed by Gregory Scott Smith, who filed this patent application.

Docket No: 358-001CIPC Page 6 of 7

Application No: 10/828,956

Response to Office Action Mailed November 10, 2010

Summary of the Remarks

Applicant invites the Examiner to contact either Gregory Smith or Earle Jennings as listed below for a telephonic interview if so doing would expedite the prosecution of the application.

Very respectfully submitted,

/Earle Jennings/

Earle Jennings

Gregory Smith & Associates

3900 Newpark Mall Rd

Third Floor, Suite 317

Newark, CA 94560

Reg. No. 44,804

Phone (510) 742-7417

Fax (510) 742-7419

Docket No: 358-001CIPC Page 7 of 7